

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1-22, 27, 30, 32, 33 and 35-38 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-38 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 10, 22 and 35 are independent claims. The Office Action indicates that claims 10-34 are allowed. Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

In view of the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

***Claim Objection***

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 35 were objected to because of insufficient antecedent basis. This objection is respectfully traversed because in this response, claims 1 and 35 have been amended to replace “formed on the same layer” with --disposed on a single plane--.

This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore Applicant does not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 35, as amended, overcomes the stated objection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection for claims 1 and 35.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 35-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,746,905 issued to Fukuda (“Fukuda”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner stated “the limitation “formed on the same layer” recited in claims 1 and 35 has not given patentable weight since there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation” (Office Action, pages 7-8).

As mentioned above, in this response, independent claim 35 has been amended to recite “a semiconductor layer comprising a semiconductor pattern and a light interception pattern *disposed on a single plane*” to address the antecedent basis issue.

The Examiner further stated “Fukuda discloses ... a semiconductor layer comprising a semiconductor pattern 12 and a light interception pattern 63 (“62” appears to be a typo) formed on the substrate 11 as shown in Fig. 9 ...” (Office Action, page 3).

However, in Fig. 9 of Fukuda, the semiconductor layer 12 is formed on the light shield layer 63. Specifically, the light shield layer 63 is formed on a plane constituted by the upper surface of the substrate 11, and the semiconductor layer 12 is formed on a plane constituted by the upper surface of the light shield layer 63.

Since the semiconductor layer 12 and the light shield layer 63 are formed on two different planes, Fukuda fails to disclose “a semiconductor layer comprising a semiconductor pattern and a light interception pattern *disposed on a single plane*”. For this reason, it is submitted that claim 35 is patentable over Fukuda. Claims 36-38 are dependent from claim 35 and would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 35-38.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,892,562 issued to Yamazaki, *et al.* (“Yamazaki”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites “a semiconductor layer comprising a semiconductor pattern and a light interception pattern *disposed on a single plane*”. As mentioned above, Fukda fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Yamazaki discloses the common electrode 404 and the drain electrode 408 are formed on the same substrate. However, Yamazaki does not disclose or suggest “a semiconductor layer comprising a semiconductor pattern and a light interception pattern *disposed on a single plane*”. Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests this claimed feature, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over them. Claims 2-9 are dependent from claim 1 and would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-9.

***Other Matters***

In addition to the aforementioned amendments made to claims 1 and 35, claims 1-22, 27, 30, 32, 33 and 35-38 have been amended solely for better wording. These amendments are not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in

claim scope is intended. Therefore Applicant does not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: March 31, 2005

**McGuireWoods LLP**  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280  
HCP:WSC/tmk

\\COM\491002.1